

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of March 7, 2006, in which claims 1-27, 33-37, 39 and 41-43 were allowed, and claims 28-32, 38, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection. With this Amendment, claims 28-32, 38, and 40 are amended. Claims 1-43 remain in the application.

With this Amendment, claims 28-32 and 38 have been amended in the preamble to insert the phrase "foldable closing" following the word "detecting". Thus, each of claims 28-32 and 38 refer specifically to the first step recited in independent claim 27 "detecting foldable closing of the cover relative to the main computer body of the portable computer".

Similarly, dependent claim 40, which depends from independent claim 39, has been amended in the preamble to insert the phrase "an unauthorized closing of the cover" following the word "detecting". The amendment to claim 40 clarifies the step of detecting in claim 39 to which claim 40 refers.

Detecting foldable closing or unauthorized closing of the cover is discussed beginning at column 4, line 19 through column 5, line 48 and again at column 6, lines 14 through 47. The steps that follow detecting foldable closing or unauthorized closing (such as detecting whether the speaker is enabled) are described in column 5, line 49 through column 6, line 13 and shown in Fig. 4.

Trapping an interrupt, as recited in dependent claim 28 and in dependent claim 40 are part of the detecting of the closing of the cover. Trapping an interrupt is described at column 5, line 21 through 32.

Causing an interrupt when the cover is closed (as recited in dependent claim 29) is part of the step of detecting cover closure. The discussing of that process begins at column 4, line 19 and continues to column 5, line 46.

A microswitch which is triggered when the cover is foldably closed (as described in dependent claim 30) is part of the step of detecting when the cover is closed. Reference to microswitch

as a means for detecting closing is found, for example, at column 4, lines 19-24 and again at column 6, lines 20-23.

Executing a portion of an alarm instruction during a boot process (as specified in claim 31) and executing an instruction segment according to an action by an unauthorized user, as defined in claim 38 both occur before foldable closing is detecting. The discussion of the boot process is found at column 5, lines 21-48 and again at column 6, lines 55-67. Reference to an authorized user activating or deactivating the alarm is found at column 6, lines 4-11.


The use of a polling technique as part of detecting closing of the cover (as described in claim 32) is detected in Figure 5, and described at column 6, line 14-48.

With this Amendment, the rejection of claim 28-32, 38 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome. Since claims 1-27, 33-37, 39 and 41-43 are allowed and claims 28-32, 38 and 40 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the application is now in condition for allowance. Notice of that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 5/2/06

By:   
David R. Fairbairn, Reg. No. 26,047  
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING  
312 South Third Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002  
Telephone: (612) 339-1863  
Fax: (612) 339-6580

DRF:ks